

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/540,020	06/22/2005	Takafumi Kawasaki	025260-099	8858
21839	7590 10/23/2006		EXAMINER	
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404			NGUYEN, DUNG V	
	IA, VA 22313-1404	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3723	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/540,020	KAWASAKI ET AL	<u>.</u> .				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Dung V. Nguyen	3723					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMU 6(a). In no event, however, may fill apply and will expire SIX (6) No cause the application to become	NICATION. y a reply be timely filed NONTHS from the mailing date of this co ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
2a) <u>□</u> 3) <u>□</u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 Seconds</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 1.	action is non-final. ce except for formal m		e ments is				
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)⊠	Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 8 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are with declaim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 6 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2005 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Th	rawn from consideration requirement. ∴ accepted or b) □ old rawing(s) be held in abeon is required if the draw	ojected to by the Examiner. /ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	• •				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) ☒ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
				•				
Attachment	(s)							
1) 🔯 Notice 2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 6/22/2005	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application 					

Application/Control Number: 10/540,020 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of species 4, claims 6 and 8, in the reply filed on 26

September 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al (USPN 6,832,606). Yamada et al discloses a multi-wire saw 1 for cutting a workpiece W while supplying a slurry containing abrasive grains to a wire 15 traveling between a plurality of rollers 11, 12 comprising a slurry supply mechanism having an holding portion 10 for holding the slurry and a temperature control mechanism for keeping the temperature of the slurry constant and to supply the slurry to the wire 15 as the wire 15 passes through the holding portion 10, a surface 21 constituting the holding portion 10 provided with a passage hole 21' allowing the wire 15 to pass therethrough. Yamada et al does not disclose expressly the holding portion 10 is provided on an upstream side of a site where the workpiece W is cut (note Fig. 1-4, col. 3, line 8 to col. 6, line 2). At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of

Application/Control Number: 10/540,020

Art Unit: 3723

design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the holding portion on upstream side of the cutting site because Applicant has not disclose that providing the holding portion on an upstream side of cutting site provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the holding portion is provided at the cutting site because the holding portion performs the same function of supply the slurry the wire. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Yamada et al to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Page 3

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Okumo et al, Hayashi et al and Huber et al are cited to show multi-wire saws.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4490. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP Program.

Application/Control Number: 10/540,020

Art Unit: 3723

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 4

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DUNG VAN NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

DVN October 19, 2006